

REMARKS

The Applicant traverses the rejection mailed August 28, 2003 (paper no. 31).

Claims 13-18 and 29 are allowed.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 19, 23, 27, 28, 30-34, 38, 40 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 4-6, 8, 10-12, 20-22, 24-26, 35-37, 39, and 41-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,990,902 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,071. In particular, the Examiner contends that the limitations of claims 4, 20 and 42 are found in the '902 patent in column 4, lines 11-14; column 2, lines 66-68 and column 8, lines 43-44. Although the Examiner cited §102(b), the text of the Office Action suggests that the Examiner intended to reject the claims under §103. In either case, the pending claims are allowable.

With regard to all of the claims, they are allowable as amended above because the independent claims have been amended to recite the use of one set of display parameters with another display or multiple displays. Support for claim amendments can be found in the specification on pages 4, 5, and 6. No new matter has been added.

Paraphrased, the amended claims claim the use of one set of display parameters for multiple displays. The subject matter claimed as set forth above is *not* found in the prior art references cited by the Examiner. If the Examiner maintains his rejection, the Applicants respectfully request that he identify by column and line number of the references where each limitation of the pending claims can be found.

Col. 4, lines 11-14 of the '902 patent discuss the reception and use of a timing parameter from a single display. Col. 2, lines 66-68 discuss changing parameters used with a single display in response to different "display mode resolutions." Col. 8, lines 43-44 is claim text, which pertains to parameters associated with a resolution of a single display.

As for the '071 patent, col. 5, lines 25-26 does not teach using display parameters of one display on another display or for that matter on multiple displays. This passage of Kotha et al. teaches that two different displays will require two different clock frequencies.

Inasmuch as the independent claims are allowable, each of the dependent claims is also allowable because each of them claim patentable subject matter. Previously-made arguments for

Appl. No. 09/182,911
Amdt. dated October 30, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2003

the allowance of the dependent claims is repeated herein by incorporating by reference, previously-made arguments for the allowance of the dependent claims.

Prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Joseph P. Krause
Registration No. 32,578

Date: October 30, 2003

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005